

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 \* \* \*

6 STEPHEN LEE CHOATE,  
7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 CHRIS WEIDICK, ET AL.,  
10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-01958-JAD-DJA

**ORDER**

11 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 34)  
12 filed on April 3, 2020. On March 19, 2020, the Court denied Plaintiff's request to for an order  
13 from the Court that Defendant Weidick's address be filed under seal with the Court so that he can  
14 complete service. (ECF No. 30).

15 A district court "possesses the inherent procedural power to reconsider, rescind, or modify  
16 an interlocutory order for cause seen by it to be sufficient[,]" so long as it has jurisdiction. *City of*  
17 *Los Angeles, Harbor Div. v. Santa Monica Baykeeper*, 254 F.3d 882, 885 (9th Cir. 2001)  
18 (quotation and emphasis omitted); *see also Smith v. Clark Cty. Sch. Dist.*, 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th  
19 Cir. 2013). This district's local rule LR 59-1 advises that "[a] party seeking reconsideration . . .  
20 must state with particularity the points of law or fact that the court has overlooked or  
21 misunderstood." LR 59-1(a). "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. A movant must not  
22 repeat arguments already presented" except in narrow circumstances. *Id.* at (b).

23 Plaintiff does not set forth a valid reason why the Court should reconsider Order ECF No.  
24 30. Defendant Weidick is the only remaining Defendant in this matter after the Court's Screening  
25 Order was issued on January 27, 2020 permitting some of his third amended complaint to  
26 proceed. (ECF No. 25). Plaintiff cited no authority for his request that the Court order the U.S.  
27 Marshal's Office to file Defendant Weidick's address under seal. Moreover, the Defendant  
28

1 Weidick appears to be a CCSD teacher, not an employee of Nevada's Southern Desert  
2 Correctional Center and thus, the Court declines to request that the Attorney General's Office  
3 notify the Court as to whether it accepts representation because that does not apply to a non-  
4 employee of SDCC. Moreover, Plaintiff appears to indicate that CCSD's attorney would accept  
5 service on Defendant Weidick's behalf if the Court ordered CCSD to do so. Again, he fails to  
6 cite any authority for the Court to force CCSD to accept service on behalf of an individual  
7 employee.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 34)  
9 is **denied**.

10  
11 DATED: April 6, 2020.

12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 DANIEL J. ALBRECHTS  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28